HAL VERB
P.O. BOX 421815
S.F. CA. 94142-1815

DEC. 23, 1991

TO: HAROLD WEISBERG
7627 OLD RECEIVER ROAD
FREDERICK, MD. 21702

Dear Harold:

I finally got to complete the listing of Oswald's Marine Corps associates. It's certainly not definitive but really is a guide. Any comments would be appreciated.

I did get to see that retired general who was in the CIA and did ask him the question you wanted to know about which was whether "Top Secret" was a prerequisite for "crypto" and he said he had no first-hand knowledge of "crypto" but that it was his belief that, yes, you had to have "TOP SECRET" clearance before getting "CRYPTO". He was unaware of the fact that Oswald had a "crypto clearance".

By the way in discussing Kennedy's position on whether to stay in Vietnam the General told me that this was brought up when he, Kennedy and others were in Vienna (I assume for the Kruschev meeting) so it has to be 1961 and not later. The General pointed out again to me that Kennedy was very wary of the intelligence he was getting. This may have meaning with respect to the Bay of Pigs affair but possibly more. The General told me that his opinions may have led to him leaving the services as if to suggest they didn't want people around who offered dissenting views).

A few notes about all of the enclosures I've submitted: These are basically reviews of the Stone film on "JFK" + contain the two major S.F. papers positions.

The alternative newspaper "S.F. Weekly" piece (by Andrew O'Hehir is really literary mush ("crap" would be a better word for it). I feel like saying as Liebeler did once when he he uttered those famous infamous words, "Well, let's just add this to the pile."

O'Hehir's assessment that the President's blood is on all our hands and that we're all guilty — we're all conspirators and, in effect, no one is to blame must make even William Manchester's prose disaster seem like authentic history next to the O'Hehir's drivel.

The problem is that these alternative papers are ill-equipped to handle anything worthwhile in this case. You'll notice that the "S.F. Weekly" piece has an article in it referring to a "private researcher" (Paul Kangas) whom they describe as a "lonely crusader". I know Kangas personally & like him as a person but he's doing a monstrous disservice to serious scholars and researchers. Read the article & you'll see the amazing list of errors. (In the Bay Area, he's the one principally responsible for the "3 tramps" fiasco. He's also got at least two presidents involved in the plotting JFK's death. By the time you receive this little the number could double to four!).

I also am enclosing a two-page summary of notes on "IMAGING PROCESSING". This is a copy sent to me by a researcher, Gus Russo. I've not had time to analyze it but I will say, though, that when Wilson starts saying things like "the fakes are terrible" (see 4th paragraph) it's enough to make you want to climb the wall

(And how many walls are we going to have to climb in the near future & next year?)

Well, I trust all the enclosed will be useful for you. I have not seen "JFK" yet (I got sick the night I was to see it & am recovering from a serious chronic cough. I'm seeing a doctor today on it! I will see it soon as ~~teeth~~ health permits & give you my thoughts on it. — Best, Hal